

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-19, 22, and 24 are pending in this application.

Claims 20, 21, 23 and 25-34 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 13, 17, 18, 19, 22, and 24 have been amended.

Regarding the § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-34 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Diwan (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,936). Applicant would agree with the Examiner that Diwan teaches a system that distributes information in a form that a subscriber requests. Diwan is limited to providing information in a data format over networks in protocols that include hypertext transfer (http), virtual terminal protocol (TELNET) and the like. See col. 3, lines 22-30. Diwan is not focused on a content provider, such as a newspaper publisher, that wishes to provide content in various formats (i.e., "in different types of channels"). The content provider does not necessarily provide information when a subscriber or user requests the information, but instead provides the information in, for example, the form of a printed newspaper, a video on a television screen, and/or an article that can be found on an Internet website. As discussed in the specification, prior distribution systems are designed with limited purpose architectures in that the systems were designed with a limited scope of functionality. For example, content would be provided to the system and the system would operate on the content so that it could be published only in a newspaper. Words would be formatted for newspaper columns and pictures were reformatted in black and white and in appropriate clarity for newspaper printing. Such content could not be used in other types of channels.

Diwan does not teach providing content "to a content provider designated channel, said content provider designated channel being at least one of a plurality of different types of channels. Diwan merely discloses a system for allowing a subscriber to request bundles of certain formats. Applicant respectfully points out that Diwan does not teach or anticipate the claimed invention. The claimed invention is not dependent on what the subscriber wants to have or how the subscriber would like to have information formatted. Instead, the claimed invention is directed toward allowing a service provider to provide content in various formats to a plurality of different types of channels.

With respect to claim 1, claim 1 recites, among other things, that the system for "providing content to a plurality of different types of channels." Furthermore, claim 1 recites, among other things, "providing the content to a content provider designated channel." Referring to Figure 1 or Figure 2 of the present application, the channels could be a WAP channel, a web channel, an email channel, a print channel or a video channel. The print channel may be for printing a newspaper or magazine. The video channel may be for television distribution. This is all clearly supported in the present specification.

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited art and respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2-16 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon claim and are not anticipated for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 17 recites, among other things, "receiving the content to be provided to the distribution channel, said distribution channel being determined by a content provider." Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art does not teach, allude to or anticipate the content provider determining which distribution channel the content is to be provided on. Instead,

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art requires that the subscriber select which distribution channel they would like to receive the information. Applicant respectfully requests that this § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that claim 17 is ready for allowance.

Claims 18, 19 and 22 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon claim 17 and are therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect to claim 17. Applicant respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that these claims are also ready for allowance.

Claim 24 recites a system for providing content over plurality of distribution channels. It further recites a means for applying at least one rule to the content wherein the "at least one rule being for defining help to provide the content to a content provider selected distribution channel" that is the content provider selects the distribution channel or channels that the content may be provided on. See Figures 1 and 2 of the present application in the associated portions of the specification. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 is not anticipated by the cited art and respectfully requests that the § 102 rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: 4/27/05

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Steven R. Greenfield

Registration No.: 38,166

JENKENS & GILCHRIST, A PROFESSIONAL
CORPORATION

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant